

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**MEYNER AND LANDIS**

COUNSELLORS AT LAW

ONE GATEWAY CENTER

SUITE 2500

NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102

ROBERT B. MEYNER  
(1908-1990)

973-624-2800  
FAX: 973-624-0356

EMAIL: MEYNER@IX.NETCOM.COM

REPLY TO WRITER

April 20, 1998

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Office of Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 222  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**RECEIVED**

APR 20 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: **New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate Petition for Expedited Declaratory Ruling CC Docket No. 96-45 DA 98-608**

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing please find the original and five copies of the Comments on behalf of New Jersey Cable Telecommunications Association in support of the Petition for Expedited Declaratory Ruling in the above referenced matter. Also, as an enclosure to the Comments, and relevant thereto, is the transcript of a portion of hearings held on September 18, 1997, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, more specifically identified in the Comments.

Pursuant to the directions of the Commission's Public Notice in this matter, three copies of these comments, with enclosure, are being provided contemporaneously to Sheryl Todd, Common Carrier Bureau, and one copy is being sent to the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Very truly yours,

MEYNER AND LANDIS



Francis R. Perkins  
Attorneys for  
New Jersey Cable Telecommunications  
Association

FRP:mm  
Enclosure

cc: LEC Proceeding Service List, w/o transcript

No. of Copies rec'd 0+5  
A B C D E

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.**

**RECEIVED**

APR 20 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service	)	
	)	DA 98-608
Fourth Order on Reconsideration	)	

**COMMENTS OF  
THE NEW JERSEY CABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION OF  
NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATE  
FOR EXPEDITED DECLARATORY RULING**

MEYNER AND LANDIS  
Francis R. Perkins  
One Gateway Center  
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5311  
973-624-2800

April 20, 1998

## INTRODUCTION

On May 8, 1997, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) released a *Report and Order* on Universal Service (*Order*).<sup>1</sup> In the *Order*, the Commission determined that service providers are required to offer schools and libraries services eligible for discounts at prices no higher than the lowest corresponding price the provider charges to similarly situated non-residential customers for similar services.<sup>2</sup> On December 30, 1997, the Commission released its *Fourth Order on Reconsideration* reaffirming its previous ruling in the *Order* “that special regulatory subsidies need not be considered in determining the lowest corresponding price” and “that each such situation should be examined on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the rate is a special regulatory subsidy or is generally available to the public.”<sup>3</sup>

On March 18, 1998, the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate (Ratepayer Advocate) submitted a Petition for Expedited Declaratory Ruling (Petition) to the Commission, seeking a ruling that:

1) certain discounted rates for services provided by Bell Atlantic-New Jersey (BA-NJ) to schools and libraries under its Access New Jersey program are not a “special regulatory subsidy,” pursuant to the *Fourth Order on Reconsideration*, and that such rates constitute

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, *Report and Order*, CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 97-157, 12 FCC Rcd 8776 (rel. May 8, 1997) (*Order*).

<sup>2</sup> *Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 9031-9032 para. 484.

<sup>3</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Access Charge Reform, Price Cap Review for Local Exchange Carriers, Transport Rate Structure and Pricing, End User Common Line Charge, *Fourth Order on Reconsideration*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, 95-72 at para. 141 (rel. Dec. 30, 1997).

the lowest corresponding price for purposes of calculating BA-NJ's reimbursement from the federal universal service fund;

2) the discounted rates offered by BA-NJ to schools and libraries under its Access New Jersey program do not preclude the schools and libraries of New Jersey from also obtaining benefits from the federal universal service fund; and

3) BA-NJ's plan to seek reimbursement from the federal universal service fund for the difference between discounted rates and tariff rates for services supplied to schools and libraries is contradictory to the Commission's ruling in the *Fourth Order on Reconsideration*.

On March 30, 1998, the Commission released a Public Notice in this matter seeking comment from interested parties, and directing that such comments be filed with the Commission on or before April 20, 1998, and that reply comments be filed on or before May 5, 1998, in accordance with the procedures set forth therein.

The New Jersey Cable Telecommunications Association (Association) (formerly known as the New Jersey Cable Television Association), is a trade association made up of the vast majority of the cable television operators operating cable television systems in the State of New Jersey. More than 2.2 million households in New Jersey are served with cable television service through almost 35,000 miles of plant, in just about every municipality in the State. The cable television industry in New Jersey is the most ubiquitous potential source of facilities-based competition to the incumbent local exchange carrier - BA-NJ.

The cable television industry in New Jersey is concerned that consumers be permitted to take full advantage of meaningful competition for the full range of telecommunications services - video, data and voice - and that as a result of regulatory action, either intentional or otherwise, does not

find itself competing against unfair advantages granted to BA-NJ.

Accordingly, the Association has actively participated in proceedings before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (NJBPU) concerning the establishment of an alternative form of regulation for BA-NJ<sup>4</sup> and in which its program known as Opportunity New Jersey (ONJ) was approved. The Association participated as a full party in that proceeding, presenting witnesses and cross-examining those presented by other parties.

The Association subsequently participated as a party in proceedings before the NJBPU examining into the establishment of competition for local exchange competition (LEC Proceeding)<sup>5</sup>, presenting testimony, cross-examining witnesses of others and briefing selected issues.

Should the relief sought by Ratepayer Advocate in its Petition not be granted, the Association is concerned that the competitive disadvantage to all other potential suppliers of local exchange services resulting thereby will be such as to foreclose competition for the services to schools and libraries concerned.

---

<sup>4</sup> *In the Matter of the Application of New Jersey Bell Telephone Company for Approval of its Plan for an Alternative Form of Regulation*, Docket No. TO92030358, 143 PUR4th 297 (May 6, 1993). BA-NJ was formerly known as New Jersey Bell Telephone Company. The historical background for the proceeding is set out in the Petition at pp. 4 and 5.

<sup>5</sup> *In Re: Notice of Pre-proposal Notice of Investigation Local Exchange Competition for Telecommunications Services*, Docket No. TX95120631

## COMMENT

The Association is in accord with the position of Ratepayer Advocate as set out in its Petition. Ratepayer Advocate appropriately states the law and facts of this matter and properly concludes that the lowest corresponding rate against which the Universal Service Fund (USF) discount should apply is the so called "Access New Jersey"<sup>6</sup> rate which resulted from the proceedings that established the Opportunity New Jersey (ONJ) plan.

The absurdity of BA-NJ's position should be apparent on its face, but is all the more striking upon the review of the testimony on cross-examination of Harold E. West, the BA-NJ witness who appeared before the NJBPU in the LEC Proceeding to support its scheme.

The cross examination of Mr. West by attorneys for AT&T, MCI, the Association, and Ratepayer Advocate on the morning of September 18, 1997<sup>7</sup>, centered around BA-NJ's claim that it is entitled to reimbursement from the federal USF for ONJ discounts from its so-called "Tariff Rate." As can be seen, BA-NJ's claim, if implemented, would lead to rather bizarre circumstances.

The basis for BA-NJ's claim is the language of a stipulation of resolution (Stipulation) entered into among the NJBPU Staff, the Ratepayer Advocate, and BA-NJ on April 18, 1997, (T 43, 91, 142) which was approved by the NJBPU in its Order Approving Stipulation (ONJ Stipulation Order) issued on June 10, 1997. The Stipulation, which is attached to the Petition as Attachment 1, and obviously entered into prior the Commission issuing the *Order* on May 8, 1997, provides at page 6 :

---

<sup>6</sup> The name applies to rates available to New Jersey schools and libraries under BA-NJ's ONJ plan.

<sup>7</sup> The transcript of the cross examination of Mr. West during the September 18, 1997 hearing in the LEC Proceeding is included as an enclosure with these Comments for the convenience to the Commission. Page references are denominated in the form "T 18," where the reference would be to page 18, for example.

If a State or Federal Universal Service policy is established that provides discounts to schools and libraries for services listed in Schedule A [of the Stipulation], schools and libraries will be able to obtain whichever discount is greater. Nothing in this agreement is intended to prohibit BA-NJ from seeking reimbursement from the Universal Service Fund for the discounts to schools & libraries described herein. Any discount agreed upon in this Stipulation shall not preclude the Ratepayer Advocate from arguing that an additional discount above that provided for in Section A (2) herein should be funded out of the Universal Service Fund and be available to schools & libraries.

All cross-examiners used the SMDS 56 kbps data service listed on Schedule A of the Stipulation as the basis of their hypothetical questions concerning the mechanics of the implementation of that which Mr. West claimed BA-NJ is entitled under the *Fourth Order on Reconsideration* and the Stipulation. As can be seen, it provides a \$225 Tariff Rate and a \$100 Proposed Education Rate, for a Percent Discount of 56%. AT&T's attorney asked if the \$125 savings per school under the ONJ rate would be counted toward the "\$50 million in savings to schools and libraries from aggressively discounted services" referred at page 2 of the Stipulation (T 18). Mr. West responded:

Right. That would be the savings to the school and that would be the amount that counts toward the \$50 million and, that would also be the amount that Bell Atlantic reserved the right to recover from the Federal Universal Service Fund.

Further, Mr. West said that, as he understands the process, any school would have the ability to alternatively select from the ONJ discount or the discount from the USF. He says: "There are two sets of discounts that co-exist as alternatives to the schools and libraries" (T 21). He at first conceded that there is no document of which he is aware that requires a school to make such a selection (T 48), but later pointed to the first sentence of the language appearing at page 6 of the Stipulation, quoted above, as a recognition of the alternative discount approach available to schools and libraries (T 142).

He said that the “post-discount” rate (as distinguished from the “Tariff Rate”) would apply as the basis for the wholesale discount to the sale to a reseller of a service which is subject to the ONJ discount (T 29). But, he then said that it is the Tariff Rate which should be the basis for the discount for which the school is eligible (T 30). When asked concerning the language at Paragraph 473 of the *Order* regarding the pre-discount price to be used to determine the discount, Mr. West said that it should be the Tariff Rate, notwithstanding that the *Order* provides that the pre-discount price is the total amount that the carrier will receive for the services it sells to schools and libraries: the sum of the discounted price paid by the schools or library and the discount amount that the carrier can recover from the universal service mechanism for providing such service (T 32).

Counsel for each of the parties lead Mr. West through examples of how the fund reimbursement would work for a particular school using BA-NJ’s theory, (e.g., T 33, 36). He reiterated that it is BA-NJ’s position that the choice of a discount is an “either/or” circumstance (T 47).

Mr. West was asked what a school would tell the USF administrator is the price of the SMDS service for which it is paying \$100, and he answered that the school would tell the administrator that the pre-discount rate is \$225 (T 52). He was then presented with the language of Paragraph 484 of the *Order*, which provides that the Commission will “require a carrier to offer services to eligible schools and libraries at prices no higher than the lowest price it charges to similarly situated non-residential customers for similar services (hereinafter ‘lowest corresponding price’)” (T 56). He asserted that BA-NJ’s position is that the Schedule A post-discount price is not equivalent to what the Commission refers to as the lowest corresponding price (T 57).

Mr. West characterized the ONJ discount plan as “very much a State Plan with a tieback to



the Federal Plan” (T 58). He was asked if such a position were inconsistent with Paragraph 527 of the *Order*, which states “[The Commission] notes that states are free to establish their own discount program under state funded programs, but such programs would not receive federal universal service support.” He said that it is BA-NJ’s position that BA-NJ still has the right to seek reimbursement under the federal *Order* for Schedule A rates (T 62, 63).

Mr. West confirmed that in order to be eligible for a federal discount, schools or libraries must go through what is described as the federally required bidding process (T 77). Mr. West was asked whether the “bid price” of BA-NJ would be the \$225 Tariff Rate, or the \$100 post-discount rate. Mr. West said that the “bid price” would be the \$225, ***but that the school administrator would have to know that the price would really be the \$100.*** (T 78 - T 84).

Questioning by counsel for the Association (T 87 - T 103) assumes a hypothetical which considers just how a school district would comply with the public bidding laws applicable to school districts, and accept a nominal “bid” of \$225 from BA-NJ as being lower than a bid of lesser amount from a competitor provider, but greater than the \$100 he says BA-NJ would really charge. Further, the hypothetical considers the concern conceivably raised by a school board attorney that certifying to the USF administrator that the price from which a discount should apply is higher than the price actually being paid might constitute a fraud by the school district. Mr. West said that everyone should know that is not the real price. Mr. West concludes that is “the consequence of having alternative discounts in the marketplace and certainly the funding administrator is going to be aware of such a situation” (T 102). Mr. West did not say how the administrator is going to be aware of the “such a situation,” however.

Under re-direct examination by BA-NJ counsel, the witness noted that there was concern that

payment to the Universal Service Fund from New Jersey sources, which he estimated to be \$80 Million, would exceed return to New Jersey by some \$40 Million (T 154). He said that it is in the best interests of New Jersey for its citizens, "corporate or otherwise" to recover as much as possible from the federal USF (T 155).

BA-NJ, in its letter of February 8, 1998, to the NJBPU, addressing the *Fourth Order on Reconsideration*, attached to the Petition as Attachment 4, argues that it would be able to obtain reimbursement for "that portion of the discount to which the school or library is entitled from the Federal Universal Service Fund<sup>8</sup>." BA-NJ goes on to posit an example of a service, the tariff price for which is \$360, the Access New Jersey price is \$180, and the federal universal service discount for the school or library in question is 20%. BA-NJ then argues that the school or library would pay BA-NJ \$180 (the Access New Jersey price), and the federal USF would reimburse BA-NJ 20% of the tariff price of \$360, or \$72. BA-NJ claims that it would "absorb" the remaining \$180. The analysis is consistent with the testimony of Witness West in response to questions on cross-examination concerning the mechanics of the refund concerning the SMDS service hypothetical used by counsel.

The letter goes on:

As BA-NJ noted in the Universal Service Phase of the Generic Proceeding, New Jersey would be penalized financially -- in the form of reduced Federal Universal Service Fund revenues flowing into the State -- unless schools and libraries were entitled to Universal Service discounts from the prediscount price before state-supported discounts were applied. The Fourth Order confirms this calculus.<sup>9</sup>

It is apparent that BA-NJ is seeking, to the extent that it can, to finance its obligations under

---

<sup>8</sup>See Attachment 4 to Petition, pp. 3, 4

<sup>9</sup>Petition, Attachment 4, page 5.

the alternative form of regulation scheme with refunds from the Federal Universal Service Fund. While it may be the subject of another debate as to whether "New Jersey" is being "penalized financially," if the Access New Jersey rate is used to establish the prediscount rate, it is a sure thing that if the Tariff Rate is used, the beneficiary will not be "New Jersey," but, rather, will be BA-NJ. BA-NJ undertakes no obligation to do anything with the higher reimbursement it would receive from the use of the Tariff Rate as the prediscount rate than to enrich its own coffers. It does not seek to use the increased proceeds to reduce rates for schools and libraries even further.

The bid process, as BA-NJ envisions it, would require the reporting of bid prices to the USF administrator that do not reflect the true cost for the services to be obtained. If Mr. West's proposition that whatever is "good for the goose is also good for the gander" (T 162) is valid, competing providers would also establish "tariff rates" which are at variance with the price a school or library would actually pay for a service, while being refunded more from the USF than if the actual price were used as the basis for the calculation of the discount.

If a competitor could not use its tariff rate against which to apply the USF discount, then a competitor would be at a significant disadvantage in competing for the provision of the service. Taking the SMDS service used in the cross-examination of Mr. West, for example, if a school were entitled to a 20% discount, it would opt for the \$100 dollar Access New Jersey rate, and BA-NJ would claim and receive a 20% from the \$225 Tariff Rate, or \$45. A competitor would have to meet the \$100 actual out-of-pocket cost to the school in order to have a hope for the business. At a 20% discount, the competitor would have to bid \$125, and would receive a \$25 reimbursement. BA-NJ could undercut the competitor by yet another \$20 below the Access New Jersey rate and be in the same net position as the competitor at the \$125 bid. Such a scenario would clearly inhibit, if not

effectively preclude, an competition for the provision of the service.

### **CONCLUSION**


BA-NJ's scheme for reimbursement for Access New Jersey services based on its Tariff Rate would result in a meaningless and chaotic bidding process; would be an impediment to competition for the provision of those services by other entities; and, would result in an unwarranted subsidy to BA-NJ's Opportunity New Jersey obligations, without bringing federal USF monies "back to New Jersey."

The Commission should grant the relief sought by Ratepayer Advocate in its Petition. Should the Commission agree, however, that the appropriate prediscount rate for federal USF discounts is BA-NJ's Tariff Rate, it should ensure that the reimbursement funds inure to the benefit of New Jersey consumers, and not BA-NJ. Further, the Commission should make clear that a "tariff rate," rather than the actual price paid, offered by competitors should also be the "prediscount rate" for calculating the amount of any refund from the federal USF for services provided by them.

Respectfully submitted,

NEW JERSEY CABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION

MEYNER AND LANDIS

By:   
Francis R. Perkins

ITS ATTORNEYS

April 20, 1998

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.**

**RECEIVED**

APR 20 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Federal-State Joint Board on )  
Universal Service )  
 )  
Fourth Order on Reconsideration )

CC Docket No. 96-45

DA 98-608

**ENCLOSURE  
TO**

**COMMENTS OF  
THE NEW JERSEY CABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION OF  
NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATE  
FOR EXPEDITED DECLARATORY RULING**

MEYNER AND LANDIS  
Francis R. Perkins  
One Gateway Center  
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5311  
973-624-2800

April 20, 1998

VOLUME 3

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1997

IN THE MATTER OF  
THE BOARD'S INVESTIGATION REGARDING  
LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPETITION FOR  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.  
DOCKET NO. TX95120631

-----

BEFORE: COMMISSIONER CARMEN J. ARMENTI

A P P E A R A N C E S:

On behalf of AT&T Communications of New Jersey,  
Inc., appears:

FREDERICK PAPPALARDO, ESQ.  
AT&T Communications, Inc.  
295 North Maple Avenue  
Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07924

On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation,  
appears:

NORRIS, MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS  
By: JAMES H. LASKEY, ESQ.  
721 Route 202-206  
P.O. Box 1018  
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018

J. H. BUEHRER & ASSOCIATES  
17 ACADEMY STREET SUITE 201  
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102  
973/623-1974 FAX: 973/643-3241

## A P P E A R A N C E S: (continued):

On behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, appear:

WILENTZ, GOLDMAN & SPITZER, ESQS.

BY: FREDERICK DENNEHY, ESQ.

90 Woodbridge Center Drive

P.O. Box 10

Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

and

ANNE S. BABINEAU, ESQ.

Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, Inc.

540 Broad Street

Room 2000

Newark, New Jersey 07101

On behalf of the Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, appears:

BLOSSOM A. PERETZ, ESQ., Director

HEIKKI LEESMENT, ESQ.

LAWANDA GILBERT, ESQ.

Deputies Ratepayer Advocate

31 Clinton Street

11th Floor

Newark, New Jersey 07102

On behalf of the New Jersey Coalition - Universal Services for Schools and Libraries, appears:

SCARINCI & HOLLENBECK, ESQS.

BY: FRANK A. BLANDINO, ESQ.

500 Plaza Drive

Secaucus, New Jersey 07096

On behalf of the Staff of the Board of Public Utilities, appears:

CAROLINE M. VACHIER, ESQ.

EUGENE PROVOST, ESQ.

Deputy Attorneys General

124 Halsey Street

Newark, New Jersey 07102

A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

On behalf of the New Jersey Cable  
Telecommunications Association, appear:

MEYNER & LANDIS, ESQS.  
BY: FRANCIS R. PERKINS, ESQ.  
Gateway One  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

On behalf of the Association for Children  
of New Jersey, appears:

MARY E. COOGAN, ESQ.  
35 Halsey Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

On behalf of the Commission of Higher Education,  
appears:

BARBARA M. KLEVA, ESQ.  
Deputy Attorney General  
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex  
CN 112  
Trenton, New Jersey 08825



would like to mark for identification as Exhibit 138 and 139 respectfully.

COMMISSIONER ARMENTI: No objection?

(No response.)

(Whereupon, Testimony of Harold E. West was marked Exhibit BANJ-139 for identification.)

(Whereupon, Rebuttal Testimony of Harold E. West was marked Exhibit BANJ-140 for identification.)

MR. DENNEHY: I'm sorry, 139 and 140. Thank you.

H A R O L D E. W E S T, being first duly sworn on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, takes the stand and testifies as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. DENNEHY:

Q Good morning, Mr. West.

A Good morning.

Q Are you the same Harold West that filed direct and rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?

1 West - direct 11

2 A Yes, I am.

3 Q Were those documents that are

4 marked for identification as Exhibit 139 and 140

5 prepared by you or under your direct supervision?

6 A Yes, they were.

7 Q Mr. West, have you any amendments

8 to either of those exhibits?

9 A One correction to the rebuttal.

10 Q And what page is that on in the

11 rebuttal, Mr. West?

12 A On Page 5, Line 23 in the middle

13 of the line where in parenthesis it currently

14 says at 17. It should read at 15, and that's it.

15 Q Thank you. Mr. West, if I were to

16 ask you the same questions that are set forth in

17 the rebuttal testimony and in the direct

18 testimony orally today, would you give the same

19 answers you have given in written form?

20 A Yes, I would.

21 Q And do you adopt those exhibits as

22 your testimony in this proceeding?

23 A Yes, I do.

24 MR. DENNEHY: Commissioner, I

25 would like to move Exhibits 139 and 140

1 West - cross 12  
2 into evidence and offer the witness for  
3 cross-examination.  
4 COMMISSIONER ARMENTI: Without  
5 objection, so ordered.  
6 (Whereupon, Exhibit BANJ-139 and  
7 Exhibit BANJ-140 previously marked for  
8 identification, were received into  
9 evidence.)  
10 COMMISSIONER ARMENTI: Mr.  
11 Pappalardo?  
12 MR. PAPPALARDO: Thank you,  
13 Commissioner.  
14 CROSS-EXAMINATION  
15 BY MR. PAPPALARDO:  
16 Q Good morning, Mr. West.  
17 A Good morning.  
18 Q My name is Rick Pappalardo. I'm  
19 here on behalf of AT&T.  
20 A Nice to meet you.  
21 Q Same here. Mr. West, I'm going to  
22 hand you an exhibit that has been marked and  
23 introduced into evidence as Exhibit AT&T-181,  
24 okay?  
25 A Okay.

Q This exists consists of essentially two documents, a Stipulation between Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, Division of Ratepayer Advocate and the Board's Staff entered into on or about April 18, according to the cover letter and behind that an Order approving the Stipulation dated June 10 of this year.

Do you have both those documents in your exhibit?

A Yes.

Q Are you familiar with the Stipulation that is contained in Exhibit AT&T-181?

A I have reviewed the education portions, yes.

Q And are you familiar with the corresponding Order that is included with Exhibit AT&T-181?

1 West - cross

14

2 A I have not reviewed the Order  
3 recently.

4 Q Had you seen the Order before?

5 A Yes, in passing.

6 Q Let me direct your attention to  
7 Page 1 of the Order where it states, I will  
8 quote: "ONJ is a program of infrastructure and  
9 technology improvement commitment which BANJ made  
10 as part of its plan for an alternative form of  
11 regulation."

12 That's in the second full  
13 paragraph. Do you see that?

14 A Yes, I do.

15 Q Is that an accurate statement?

16 A Yes, it is.

17 Q And the purpose of the June 10th  
18 Order as reflected on Page 4 of the Order was to  
19 -- I believe it's in the second full paragraph,  
20 was to address Bell Atlantic's progress and  
21 compliance with ONJ and the appropriateness of  
22 accelerating ONJ as well as the proposed  
23 stipulation.

24 Would you agree with that  
25 statement?

2 A I'm sorry, where?

3 Q This is in the second full  
4 paragraph. It's in the second sentence -- I'm  
5 sorry, the third sentence. The sentence begins,  
6 "This ONJ Order addresses BANJ's progress and  
7 compliance with ONJ." The third sentence of the  
8 paragraph.

9 MR. DENNEHY: Excuse me, that's  
10 Page 4?

11 MR. PAPPALARDO: Yes, Page 4.

12 THE WITNESS: I see it.

13 Q Is that an accurate statement as  
14 well to the best of your knowledge?

15 A Yes, it is.

16 Q Are you aware of any modifications  
17 made to the stipulation that's included with  
18 AT&T-181?

19 A No, I'm not.

20 Q And on Page 1 of that stipulation,  
21 it states in the second paragraph, middle of the  
22 first sentence: "BANJ agrees to implement the  
23 proposals set forth in detail hereafter which the  
24 parties reasonably value and estimated value of  
25 benefits to ratepayers of \$176 million."

2 Do you see that statement?

3 A Yes, I do, and the operative word  
4 in that statement is "estimate".

5 Q And you agree that's an accurate  
6 statement, right?

7 A Right. In Order to be accurate,  
8 you have to have the word "estimate" in the  
9 sentence.

10 Q And one part of that estimate is,  
11 turning to Page 2 and I am quoting again from the  
12 stipulation, "\$50 million in savings to Schools  
13 and Libraries from aggressively discounted  
14 services."

15 Will you agree that is one element  
16 that goes into the \$176 million that is referred  
17 to on Page 1?

18 A Yes, I would.

19 Q If you would turn to Page 10 of  
20 the Order, and I'm sorry to be jumping back and  
21 forth, on Page 10 of the Order -- are you there?

22 A Okay.

23 Q Do you see the paragraph with the  
24 number 1 to the left of it near the bottom of the  
25 page?

1 West - cross

17

2 A Yes, I do.

3 Q Could you read that paragraph into  
4 the record, please?

5 A "That BANJ developed tracking  
6 capabilities responsive to reporting requirements  
7 to be developed by the Board to ensure that the  
8 commitments contained herein ONJ are met as  
9 detailed in the plan and the attached  
10 stipulation."

11 Q To the best of your knowledge,  
12 Bell Atlantic has not sought to modify this part  
13 of the Order or have any dispute with that part  
14 of the Order?

15 A No. We have committed to certain  
16 initiatives and we will follow through.

17 Q Now, the \$50 million estimate that  
18 we referred to a few moments ago, does that  
19 number essentially reflect the level of the  
20 discounts provided to the Schools and Libraries  
21 and some estimate of usage of those services for  
22 Schools and Libraries?

23 Would that be a fair way to  
24 characterize how that number was arrived at?

25 A My assumption is some take rate



1 West - cross

2 was developed and multiplied by the various  
3 discounts to arrive at an estimated figure of \$50  
4 million.

5 Q So, just for example, if you go to  
6 Schedule A of the stipulation.

7 A Yes.

8 Q One of the services there is a  
9 SMDS and it has a tariff rate of 225 and a  
10 proposed education rate of 100.

11 A That's correct.

12 Q And just so I understand how this  
13 would work, if ten schools purchase that service  
14 at the education rate then effectively there  
15 would be 125 savings per school or 1,250 total  
16 and that total would essentially count toward the  
17 \$50 million I have talked about earlier?

18 A Right. That would be the savings  
19 to the school and that would be the amount that  
20 counts toward the \$50 million and, that would  
21 also be the amount that Bell Atlantic reserved  
22 the right to recover from the Federal Universal  
23 Service Fund.

24 Q That is the type of data that Bell  
25 had agreed to keep track of under the Order.